

enduring interests of Israel are inextricably interwoven with the interests of the U.S. may not be correct in a formal and legal sense, but the spirit of these positions should be welcomed and appreciated. From the ashes of any temporary crisis or stresses we expect Israel and the U.S. to emerge strongly, fighting together for the same long-term principles and ideals. Temporary disagreements about strategy and tactics must never be allowed to separate us. Based on our individual perceptions and interpretations some of us oppose the war in Iraq; and some others support it. This difference does not break out along any clear ethnic, racial or religious lines. What we must jointly never forget during this current crisis is that there are hostile enemies of democracy and that Israel must be kept strong in order to remain as a model on the front lines fighting to save the kind of government which Abraham Lincoln said should never perish from the earth.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TEACHING FELLOWS ACT

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Teaching Fellows Act of 2003 with fourteen original cosponsors.

The most critical education issue we face is the recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers. In order to keep pace with anticipated retirements and the growing student population, local school districts will need to hire an estimated 2.5 million teachers over the next ten years! These projected shortages are especially serious in some states and districts—especially inner cities and the rapidly growing West and South—and in subjects such as special education, mathematics, physical sciences, and foreign languages.

While all the education improvements and reforms we envision are dependent on a first-rate teaching force, neither political party has given teacher recruitment and retention top billing on its education agenda or has moved beyond stereotypical responses to the challenge.

Neither offering federal stipends or student loan forgiveness to prospective teachers—as proposed by the Clinton administration—nor exhorting individuals to pursue teaching careers—an approach favored by the current administration—is likely to produce the kind of intensive, sustained effort we need to nurture prospective teachers, strengthen their professional identity, and help them succeed once they enter the classroom.

There is no single, simple solution, but I believe that North Carolina's successful Teaching Fellows program offers a model for national emulation. The Teaching Fellows Act would create two federal programs to encourage our best and brightest students to enter and remain in the field of teaching by offering them scholarships as well as professional development and mentoring assistance. One program would offer fellowships and intensive training for high school seniors and college sophomores who want to become teachers, while another would enable teaching assistants and other community college students to

earn their four-year teaching certificates. In exchange, these scholarship recipients would be required to teach for at least four years in a public school or three years in a low-performing school following graduation.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that every teacher be "highly-qualified" by the 2005–06 school year. In order to meet that need, we must embark on an unprecedented teacher recruitment and retention effort. The Teaching Fellows Act gets to the heart of the need for quality and quantity in America's teaching force. We know that such programs work, and with the federal support this bill would provide, these state programs could be building blocks for the intensive national recruitment and retention effort that is essential to strengthening our public education system.

I would like to invite all members of the House to cosponsor the Teaching Fellows Act, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure our schools will have the teachers they need to be successful.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, and 126 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Aye" on rollcall vote 119; "No" on rollcall vote 120; "No" on rollcall vote 121; "No" on rollcall vote 122; "No" on rollcall vote 123; "Aye" on rollcall vote 124; "Aye" on rollcall vote 125; and "Aye" on rollcall vote 126.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2003

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Good Samaritan Volunteer Firefighter Assistance Act of 2003." This legislation removes a barrier which has prevented some organizations from donating surplus fire fighting equipment to needy fire departments. Under current law, the threat of civil liability has caused some organizations to destroy fire equipment, rather than donating it to volunteer, rural and other financially-strapped departments.

We know that every day, across the United States, firefighters respond to calls for help. We are grateful that these brave men and women work to save our lives and protect our homes and businesses. We presume that these firefighters work in departments which have the latest and best firefighting and protective equipment. What we must recognize is that there are an estimated 30,000 firefighters who risk their lives daily due to a lack of basic Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). In both rural and urban fire departments, limited budgets make it difficult to purchase more than fuel and minimum maintenance. There is not enough money to buy new equipment. At the

same time, certain industries are constantly improving and updating the fire protection equipment to take advantage of new, state-of-the-art innovation. Sometimes, the surplus equipment may be almost new or has never been used to put out a single fire. Sadly, the threat of civil liability causes many organizations to destroy, rather than donate, millions of dollars of quality fire equipment.

Not only do volunteer fire departments provide an indispensable service, some estimates indicate that the nearly 800,000 volunteer firefighters nationwide save state and local governments \$36.8 billion a year. While volunteering to fight fires, these same, selfless individuals are asked to raise funds to pay for new equipment. Bake sales, pot luck dinners, and raffles consume valuable time that could be better spent training to respond to emergencies. All this, while surplus equipment is being destroyed.

In states that have removed liability barriers, such as Texas, fire companies have received millions of dollars in quality fire fighting equipment. The generosity and good will of private entities donating surplus fire equipment to volunteer fire companies are well received by the firefighters and the communities. The donated fire equipment will undergo a safety inspection by the fire company to make sure firefighters and the public are safe.

We can help solve this problem. Congress can respond to the needs of fire companies by removing civil liability barriers. This bill accomplishes this by raising the current liability standard from negligence to gross negligence. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and look forward to working with the Judiciary Committee to bring this bill to the House Floor.

CRACKDOWN IN CUBA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to submit the following interesting and insightful article for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WHY THE CRACKDOWN IN CUBA?
(By Wayne S. Smith)

Various newspaper articles reporting the deplorable crackdown on dissidents in Cuba have correctly noted that the situation there earlier had seemed to be inching toward somewhat greater tolerance. During his trip to Cuba in May of last year, for example, President Carter met with Cuban dissidents and in his televised speech to the nation spoke of the Varela Project, an initiative of theirs calling for greater political freedoms. And both before and after Carter's visit, many other Americans, myself included, regularly and openly met with the dissidents as part of a broad effort to expand dialogue and improve relations between our two countries.

Oswaldo Paya, the principal architect of the Varela Project, was even recently allowed to come to the United States to receive the W. Averell Harriman award from the National Democratic Institute in Washington, and from there he went on to Europe. The Cuban government may not have liked what he had to say while abroad, but he wasn't punished for it when he returned home. It did indeed seem that things might

slowly be moving toward somewhat greater tolerance of dissent on the island.

Why then the recent arrest of dissidents? Is it, as some in the United States quickly posited, that Castro was simply hoping the rest of the world was so distracted by the war in Iraq, that no one would notice or react to the detention of a few dissidents in Cuba?

No, that explanation simply doesn't hold up. First of all, no one in his right mind (and whatever else he is, Castro is that) would have expected the arrest of over 80 dissidents, many of them well-known international figures, to go unremarked. The Cubans expected a firestorm, and they got it.

Second, the timing could hardly be worse from Castro's standpoint. The UN Human Rights Commission has just begun its annual deliberations to decide, among other things, whether to condemn Cuba for violations of human rights. Given the greater tolerance discussed above, there had seemed a good chance that Cuba would not be condemned this year. The crackdown, coming just now, makes that far less likely.

Given all that, why the crackdown and why now? To answer those questions, we must first note that the greater leeway for dissent noted above came in response to the overtures of groups in the American Congress and the American public, not to any easing of the hard line on the part of the Bush Administration. Quite the contrary, its policies and rhetoric remained as hostile and as threatening as ever. It ignored all Cuban offers to begin a dialogue and instead held to an objective of regime change. As Mr. James Cason, the Chief of the U.S. Interests Section has stated publicly, one of his tasks was to promote "transition to a participatory form of government."

Now, we would all like to see a more open society in Cuba; that indeed, is what we are all working toward. But it is not up to the United States to orchestrate it. In fact, it is not up to the United States to decide what form of government Cuba should have. Cuba is, after all, a sovereign country. To the Cubans, for the chief U.S. diplomat in Cuba to seem to be telling them what kind of government they should have seemed a return to the days of the Platt Amendment.

The Bush Administration was uncomfortable with signs of greater tolerance on Castro's part, for that simply encouraged those in the United States who wanted to ease travel controls and begin dismantling the embargo. New initiatives along those lines were expected in the Congress this spring. What to do to head them off?

What the Administration did is clear enough. It ordered the Chief of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana to begin a series of high-profile and provocative meetings with dissidents, even holding seminars in his own residence and passing out equipment of various kinds to them. He even held press conferences after some of the meetings. The Administration knew that such "bull-in-the-china-shop" tactics would provoke a Cuban reaction—hopefully an overreaction. And given that the purpose was "regime change", the Cubans came to see them as "subversive" in nature and as increasingly provocative. Those arrested were not charged with expressing themselves against the state, but with "plotting with American diplomats."

The circumstances are different, but to understand Cuban sensitivities in this case, let us imagine the reaction of the U.S. Government if Cuban diplomats here were meeting with members of the Puerto Rican Independence Party to help them promote Puerto Rico's transition from commonwealth to independence. Perhaps the Attorney General would not arrest everyone involved, but I wouldn't take any bets on it.

And the beginning of the war in Iraq did play a role in the crackdown. The Cubans saw it as a signal that the United States was determined to throw its weight around and to blow away anyone it doesn't like through the unilateral use of force. As one Cuban official put it to me recently: "This new pre-emptive-strike policy of yours puts us in a new ball game, and in that new game, we must make it clear that we can't be pushed around."

It was this kind of mind set that led to the crackdown and that turned the latter into a massive overreaction. The Cubans did exactly what the Bush Administration had hoped they would do. Virtually the whole active dissident community has now not only been arrested but put on trial (or notified that they soon will be) and given extremely heavy sentences. Tragic. This is a blot that will not be easily erased and that will impede any significant progress in U.S.-Cuban relations until there is some amelioration of conditions in Cuba. The Bush Administration meanwhile will certainly continue the pressures, and the provocations, so as to prevent any such amelioration.

It has been argued that Castro simply saw this as a propitious moment to halt dissent in Cuba, and there are doubtless some elements of truth to that argument. Castro has never liked to be criticized. Still, over the past few years, he had tolerated criticism of the system. All things being equal, he might have continued to do so. But the situation has changed, not just between the U.S. and Cuba, but internationally, in ways that the U.S. public is just beginning to understand.

In the dark days that lie ahead, people of good will in the United States who want to see a more normal relationship between our two countries, and to see a more open society in Cuba, should hold to the demonstrable truth that the best way to bring about both is through the reduction of tensions, the beginning of a meaningful dialogue and increased contacts. As Elizardo Sanchez, Cuba's leading human rights activist, has often put it, "the more American citizens in the streets of Cuban cities, the better for the cause of a more open society; so why do you maintain travel controls?" The policies followed by one administration after another over the past 44 years have accomplished nothing positive. True to form, the policy followed by the Bush Administration, and the clumsy tactics of the U.S. Interests Section, have produced only a crackdown. Exactly what we should not want!

Wayne S. Smith, now a Senior Fellow at the Center for International Policy, was Third Secretary of Embassy at the American Embassy in Havana from 1958 until the U.S. broke relations in January of 1961, and was Chief of the U.S. Interests Section there from 1979 until 1982.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE TERRORIST VICTIM CITIZENSHIP RELIEF ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce legislation that would grant citizenship to the spouses and children of legal immigrants who were killed on September 11, 2001. Additionally, this legislation would grant honorary citizenship to those legal immigrants who were killed in the attacks. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, left approximately 100

surviving spouses and children of legal immigrants in jeopardy of being deported, because their immigration status was linked to a family member who was employed at the World Trade Center. While the USA PATRIOT Act allowed these individuals to stay in the United States until September 10, 2002, that reprieve has expired. These individuals should not be forced to leave the country because of the actions of the terrorists.

GUY LEWIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ELECTED INTO THE BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to learn that this past Monday, Guy V. Lewis was not elected into the Basketball Hall of Fame, despite of his obvious qualifications and contributions to the game.

Coach Lewis has had a tremendous impact on the game of basketball throughout our country and in Texas, having coached the University of Houston Cougars for more than 30 years. This university is my alma mater, and the school pride that he instilled during the tenure still lingers today.

This exemplary coach led the Cougars to 592 wins, 5 final fours, 14 NCAA title games, and 2 NCAA titles.

He also coached his team in the historical 1968 UH vs. UCLA game, which was the first collegiate game ever nationally televised and the largest crowd to watch a collegiate game at that time. I'm proud to say I was there as a University of Houston student.

Star players Hakeem Olajuwon, Clyde Drexler, and Elvin Hayes, all named among the NBA's 50 greatest players of all time, got their start at the University of Houston with Coach Lewis. But despite all of Coach Lewis' accomplishments, he was still over looked for the Hall of Fame.

Coach Lewis is only 81 years old, and although he may not have been elected this time around, I want him to know that sports fans everywhere consider him to be a true pioneer of basketball.

I know that I speak for all Houstonians when I say that we are very proud of Coach Lewis. I look forward to congratulating him on his election into the Basketball Hall of Fame in the very near future.

COMMENDING MR. RONNIE RAPER

HON. ZACH WAMP

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 11, 2003

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery of Rhea County Commission Chairman Ronnie Raper. Earlier this week, Chairman Raper risked his own life to save Melinda Andrews, 13, from the raging waters of the Richland Creek in Rhea County, Tennessee.

On Monday, April 7th Ronnie Raper, a building inspector, happened to be in his car and heard a 911 call over his radio indicating